



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,009	09/11/2003	Susann Marie Keohane	AUS920030388US1	5929
7590 Leslie Van Leeuwen Intellectual Property Law Department International Business Machines Corporation 11400 Burnet Road, Internal Zip 4054 Austin, TX 78758			EXAMINER WANG, LIANG CHE A	
			ART UNIT 2155	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/13/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/660,009

Applicant(s)

KEOHANE ET AL.

Examiner

Liang-che Alex Wang

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 26 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 26 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 26-27 are presented for examination.
2. Claims 2-4, 7, 9-11, 14-25 are canceled, claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 12 and 13 are amended and claims 26-27 are added.

The New Grounds of Rejection

3. Applicant's amendment and argument with respect to claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, and new claims 26-27 filed on 5/23/2007 have been fully considered but they are deemed to be moot in views of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 26-27 are objected to because of the following informalities:
5. Claim 1, lines 22-23 recites the limitation "... a stored list of of the IP ...", should be changed to "... a stored list of the IP ...".
6. Claims 1, 8 and 26 recites the limitation of "the business organization employee", There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
7. All dependent claims are objected to as having the same deficiencies as the claims they depend from.
8. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

9. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

10. Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims are directed to software per se, which does not fall into the categories of “process”, “machine”, “manufacture” and “composition of matter”. Referring to claim 26, claim 26 recites a computer program which renders the claim a “software” claim.
11. All dependent claims are rejected to as having the same deficiencies as the claims they depend from.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tu, US Publication Number 2004/0027391A1, in views of Fichadia et al., US Publication Number 2002/0124184, hereinafter Fichadia.
14. Referring to claim 1, Tu teaches, in a World Wide Web (Web) communication network (network 10 figure 1) with user access via a plurality of data processor controlled

interactive receiving display stations for displaying received hypertext Web documents (page 8 [0115], lines 13-19], a plurality of users use a plurality of computers to access to different web pages), transmitted from business organization sites (see figure 2-12, “consulting business”) on the Web (page 4 [0076], web pages are provided from web site 20), including at least one display page containing text, images and a plurality of embedded hyperlinks (figures 2-12), each hyperlink being user activatable to access and display a respective linked Web hypertext document, a system for linking a user activated hyperlink to alternate Web documents (page 8 [0115] lines 13-19, figure 15) comprising:

- a. means for linking at least one of said hyperlinks when activated to access a selectable one of a plurality of alternate protected Web documents accessible from sites on an internal network of said business organization connected to the web network (page 8 [0115], lines 13-19, figure 15, the same navigational link selected by users of different computers may result in the different computer links to different web pages; page 7 [0113], web document are protected since not all the users can access to the web document);
- b. means for predetermining the one of said plurality of alternate Web documents including data protected by said business organization selected to be accessed upon said activation of said hyperlink (page 7 [0113], page to be displayed is predetermined and selected based on addresses of computers) based upon the web (IP) address of the user’s receiving display station (page 7 [0113], lines 9-17, alternate website are selected based on address of computer; page 4 [0075], [0076] lines 11-15, address of computer in a web environment is the web (IP)

address) including: determining whether said user is authorized to have access to the protected data from a stored list of the IP addresses; and

- c. means responsive to said predetermining means for accessing said alternate Web document selected to be accessed (page 7 [0113], lines 9-24, after checking with the list of addresses, alternate web document selected will be accessed).

Tu does not teach, the list of the authorized receiving display station is the list of receiving display stations of the business organization employees.

Fichadia teaches access to protected resource is granted to business employees based on a access control list (page 1 [0004]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have Tu to have the access to protected resources granted according the access control list which includes authorized business employees as taught by Fichadia because both Tu and Fichadia teaches authorizing access to business resources according to a access control list.

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Tu, because having the access control list to include business employees would allow a user, especially an employee of a business, to efficiently and quickly submit a request through the chain of command and obtain the request approval as taught by Fichadia (Page 1 [0008])

15. Referring to claim 6, Tu as modified teaches the Web communication network of claim 2 wherein said means for selecting one of said alternative documents further includes:

- a. a table of IP addresses (page 7 [0113 line 18, list of address corresponds to “table of IP addresses”);
 - b. means for comparing the user's receiving station address to the table (page [0013], lines 17-19); and
 - c. means for accessing one of said alternative documents based upon said comparison (page 7 [0113] lines 19-24, page [0115] lines 17-19).
16. Referring to claims 8, 13, 26 and 27 claims 8, 13, 26 and 27 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 1 and 6. Therefore, claims 8, 13, 26 and 27 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 1 and 6.
17. Claims 5, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tu, in views of Fichadia, and in further views of Hastings et al., US Patent Number 6,370,629, hereinafter Hastings.
18. Referring to claims 5, 12, Tu as modified teaches the invention as described in claims 1, and 8. Tu further teaches means for selecting one of said alternative documents is selected based upon the address of the user's receiving display station address (page 7 [0113]).

Tu does not explicitly teaches, the selection is based on geographical location.

However, Hastings teaches, a method for controlling access to stored information by determining the actual geographical location.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select one of said alternative documents based upon the

determination of the geographical location because both Tu and Hasting teaches access controlling with authorization determinations (Tu, page 7 [0113], Hastings, abstract).


A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Tu because having the access selection determined based upon the geographical location can restrict use of that information (web page) to designated geographic regions or can exclude designated regions where use is not permitted as taught by Hastings (Col 2 lines 38-40).


Conclusion

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
20. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2155

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Liang-che Alex Wang whose telephone number is (571)272-3992. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.
22. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571)272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
23. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Liang-che Alex Wang 
June 25, 2007


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER